

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Nebraska



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

244

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

See Attachment

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Technical Assistance: The NDE Office of Special Education has several mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of evidence-based technical assistance and support to local education agencies. Nebraska's statewide system of technical assistance is based on regional support networks with multiple collaborating partners engaged in this process.

Through regional and statewide assignments, the NDE special education staff provides ongoing technical assistance to support school districts in addressing their unique needs and challenges. The NDE Office of Special Education created the ILCD process based upon the State Performance Plan (SPP) Part B indicators. The ILCD process is designed to enhance program improvement that will result in improved outcomes for children with disabilities. With stakeholder input, NDE organized the SPP indicators into three Impact Areas:

- Improving developmental outcomes and academic achievement (school readiness) for children with disabilities;
- Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies; and
- Improving transitions for children with disabilities from early intervention to adult living.

This comprehensive "big picture" approach provides a broader view for improving achievement outcomes within a continuous improvement framework. Technical assistance for the ILCD process is also delivered through regional ILCD facilitators located in each ESU across the state.

Regional Planning Region Teams (PRTs), functioning as Local Interagency Coordinating Councils, receive annual NDE grants to support Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) practitioners in implementing evidence-based practices for children birth to age five and their families. Since 1979, NDE's Early Childhood Training Center (ECTC) has been the hub of technical assistance and professional development statewide for teachers and providers in early care and education settings. The ECTC infrastructure has been expanded to include a statewide network of regional Early Learning Coordinators located at ESUs.

The University of Nebraska System is a major component of the statewide infrastructure with specialized expertise leveraged in the delivery of technical assistance to local school districts. Disability specific regional networks of technical assistance include cadres within the ESU structure that support a full-range of technical assistance and professional development in evidence-based practices related to various disabilities.

Through the framework of the Nebraska Council of Teacher Education, stakeholders representing LEAs, ESUs and institutions of higher education (IHEs) assist NDE in the revision of general and special education endorsements to ensure that IHEs meet the highest professional standards in their degree programs and produce highly qualified staff to support children with disabilities.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Professional Development: NDE provides an array of professional development opportunities through cross-team efforts within the Department to ensure that education providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities. NDE's Early Childhood Training Center (ECTC) has been the hub of technical assistance and professional development statewide for teachers and providers in early care and education settings. The NDE Office of Special Education also works in partnership with LEAs, ESUs, and IHEs to provide a coherent, comprehensive and aligned network of professional development.

These statewide networks work in collaboration with NDE to increase the capacity of regular and special education teachers, related services providers and administrators to implement evidence-based practices such as Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention (RtI), Positive Behavior Supports (PBIS) and Early Childhood Positive Behavior Supports (EC-PBIS Pyramid Model). The networks also focus on specific supports for students who experience autism spectrum disorder, traumatic brain injury, and sensory impairments.

Transitions from early intervention (Part C to Part B) and from school to career/college readiness are another priority area of support. NDE Office of Special Education consultants deliver and supervise the delivery of professional development for evidence-based practices.

Many of Nebraska's districts have small student populations located in rural, geographically isolated locations. In response, NDE provides support to multiple, small, rural districts to form consortiums and maximize the impact of their professional development efforts. The focus of grant funding is within the areas emphasized in the NDE Impact Areas as described previously in Quality Standards. Grants also are directed toward the preparation of qualified educators, administrators and related service providers, offering induction/mentoring support, and continuous development over individual careers. As grant managers, NDE staff is involved in approving grant applications, monitoring completion of grant activities, approving reimbursement claims, and offering technical assistance to enhance project outcomes.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SiMRs.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

School district performance on each of the APR indicators is reported each spring on the Nebraska Education Profile on the Nebraska Department of Education website. The report can be found at, <http://nep.education.ne.gov>. The Nebraska Education Profile provides information and data about Nebraska public schools and student performance, including district performance on the APR indicators. A copy of the state's SPP/APR is located on the Nebraska Department of Education, Special Education office website at, <https://www.education.ne.gov/sped/public-reporting/>

Nebraska as also always posted a link to Grads360 <https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr> for the LEAs and public to view state level data.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	69.55%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	71.48%	72.07%	71.26%	70.46%	71.41%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,815
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	2,619

Source	Date	Description	Data
(EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)			
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	69.30%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,815	2,619	71.41%	90.00%	69.30%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The Nebraska Office of Special Education has provided technical assistance to LEAs over the past year on correct coding of students exiting and education surrounding Nebraska not having an alternative diploma. This may account for the decrease in graduation. The Office of Special Education plans to continue this training and working with districts to ensure maintenance of goals and transition plans to improve graduation outcomes.

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Nebraska's definition of a graduate with a regular high school diploma, which applies for all students, is a student who completed an approved program of study and met district/system requirements for a high school diploma. The diploma requirements are fully aligned with the Nebraska's academic content standards. Nebraska does not have a recognized alternate diploma pathway for students with disabilities. The Cohort Four-Year Graduation Rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less by the number of students in the Graduation Cohort. The rate includes students who graduate in the summer of the Expected Graduation Year. NDE lags the Cohort-Four-Year Graduation Rate. The "lag" for graduation rates allows states to use the previous year's graduation data so that summer school graduates are included in the graduation rate calculation for reporting. Formula: High School Diploma Recipients (YEAR X) FIRST-TIME ninth graders [(YEAR X) – 4] + (transfer in) - (transfer out)]

Cohort Extended 5th Year Graduation Rate - The Cohort Extended 5th Year Graduation Rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma in five years or less by the number of students in the Graduation Cohort. The rate includes students who graduate in the summer of the Expected Graduation Year plus one additional school year. For the additional school year, the cohort is adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country or die during the time before the Expected Graduation year. This rate is based on the standards published by the US Department of Education. NDE lags the Cohort Extended 5th Year Graduation Rate for AYP purposes. The "lag" for graduation rates allows states to use the previous year's graduation data so that summer school graduates are included in the graduation rate calculation for reporting.

Formula: High School Diploma Recipients (YEAR X) FIRST-TIME ninth graders [(YEAR X) – 4] + (transfer in) - (transfer out)] + 1 SY

Cohort Extended 7th Year Graduation Rate- The Cohort Extended 7th Year Graduation Rate is the same as the Four-Year (The Cohort Four-Year Graduation is calculated by dividing the number of students in a cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less by the number of students in the Graduation Cohort) and uses the number of students who graduate in seven years or less, including students who graduate in the 3 additional school years. Formula: High School Diploma Recipients (YEAR X) + High School Diploma Recipients (YEAR 1+2+3) FIRST-TIME ninth graders [(YEAR X-7) + (transfer in)-(transfer out)]

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	2.26%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	1.61%	1.95%	1.95%	1.93%	1.91%
Data	1.55%	1.43%	1.41%	1.53%	1.46%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	1.89%	1.89%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the

development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,159
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	151
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	26
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	337
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	20

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
337	23,107	1.46%	1.89%	1.46%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The numerator consists of the number of youth with IEPs in grades 7-12 who exited special education due to dropping out. The denominator consists of the total number of youth in grades 7-12 who were served in special education during the school year therefore having the potential to drop out of school.

In Nebraska, a dropout occurs in any of the following instances: A student who withdrew for personal or academic reasons and does not have a signed Withdrawal from Mandatory Attendance form pursuant to Nebraska Revised Statute 79-202 on file with the district. A student removed from the education system for other than health reasons, and whose return is not anticipated. A student enrolled in adult education or some type of program whose education services do not lead to a diploma or other credential recognized by the state. A student who has not graduated or completed an approved program and is not enrolled and whose status is unknown; this includes a student withdrawn from the rolls for excessive absence. A student who moved out of the district, out of state, or out of U.S. and is not known to be in school (includes any student whose education status cannot be confirmed either through a parent or other responsible adult or through some formal notification of transfer.) A student in an institution that is not primarily educational (Army, or vocational program) and not considered a special school district/system. A student who is disenrolled by a parent and does not enroll in another district/system. A student who was suspended or expelled and the disciplinary period has expired and student has not returned.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

One of the possible discrepancies that we have identified is the Federal definition, which identified exiters ages 14-21 whereas Nebraska's dropout definition looks at student data grades 7-12. Another area of possibility is the cleaning up of the file. The EDEN file is locked data whereas our dropout file is a cleaned up, more recent file.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	99.64%	Actual	99.80%	99.66%	99.38%	99.00%	99.14%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2010	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	99.50%	Actual	99.77%	99.66%	99.31%	99.00%	99.07%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	4,124	4,315	4,212	3,563	3,719	3,550					2,899
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,510	1,451	1,286	1,049	1,094	1,040					600
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,353	2,590	2,664	2,264	2,370	2,229					1,920
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	251	253	242	238	240	244					248

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	4,126	4,309	4,212	3,561	3,718	3,552					2,899
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,463	1,346	1,180	930	945	896					600
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,402	2,688	2,770	2,375	2,516	2,379					1,919
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	251	253	242	238	240	244					247

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	26,382	26,136	99.14%	95.00%	99.07%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	26,377	26,124	99.07%	95.00%	99.04%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

School district performance on each of the APR indicators is reported each year on the Nebraska Department of Education website. The report can be found at:

<https://nep.education.ne.gov//State/Index/00-0000-000?DataYears=20182019&type=state#nesa-scores>

This link shows the following under a tree on the left side, broken down by English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science, then further broken down by Percent Proficient, Average Scale Scores, and Participation by toggling the tree. See attached screenshot in attachments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

This has been provided at the following link <https://nep.education.ne.gov//State/Index/00-0000-000?DataYears=20182019&type=state#nesa-scores>

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR required the State to provide OSEP with a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The State provided the required information.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Elementary	X	X	X								
B	Middle School				X	X	X					
C	High School											X
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	24.32%
A	Elementary	24.32%	Actual	52.52%	58.63%	62.13%	26.99%	24.32%
B	Middle School	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	15.43%
B	Middle School	15.43%	Actual	44.45%	45.95%	49.33%	15.87%	15.43%

C	High School	2017	Target ≥	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	14.95%
C	High School	14.95%	Actual	33.23%	31.09%	34.81%	17.21%	14.95%
D			Target ≥					
D			Actual					
E			Target ≥					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target ≥					
G			Actual					
H			Target ≥					
H			Actual					
I			Target ≥					
I			Actual					
J			Target ≥					
J			Actual					
K			Target ≥					
K			Actual					
L			Target ≥					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2017	Target ≥	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	23.51%
A	Elementary	23.51%	Actual	50.83%	52.01%	52.26%	51.01%	23.51%
B	Middle School	2017	Target ≥	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	18.94%
B	Middle School	18.94%	Actual	35.89%	36.03%	35.27%	31.26%	18.94%
C	High School	2017	Target ≥	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	15.84%
C	High School	15.84%	Actual	23.84%	23.60%	24.06%	18.74%	15.84%
D			Target ≥					
D			Actual					
E			Target ≥					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					

G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary	24.32%	25.32%
Reading	B >=	Middle School	15.43%	16.43%
Reading	C >=	High School	14.95%	15.95%
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Elementary	23.51%	24.51%
Math	B >=	Middle School	18.94%	19.94%
Math	C >=	High School	15.84%	16.84%
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the

State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	4,114	4,294	4,192	3,551	3,704	3,513					2,768
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	739	733	466	343	331	254					94
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	303	336	151	145	152	131					215
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	124	107	97	99	93	92					107

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	4,116	4,287	4,192	3,543	3,701	3,519					2,766
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	754	627	522	381	305	217					128
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	292	311	295	260	256	174					229

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	136	130	113	109	127	91					96

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	12,600	3,056	24.32%	24.32%	24.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Middle School	10,768	1,640	15.43%	15.43%	15.23%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	High School	2,768	416	14.95%	14.95%	15.03%	Met Target	No Slippage
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary	XXX
B	Middle School	XXX
C	High School	XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	12,595	3,180	23.51%	23.51%	25.25%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Middle School	10,763	1,920	18.94%	18.94%	17.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C	High School	2,766	453	15.84%	15.84%	16.38%	Met Target	No Slippage
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary	XXX
B	Middle School	LEA's are still in the process of implementing the more rigorous College and Career Ready standards for Mathematics. There were many grade level changes of standards from the previous ones and students are still working achieving proficiency with the changes in standards.
C	High School	XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://nep.education.ne.gov//State/Index/00-0000-000?DataYears=20182019&type=state#nesa-scores>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP

reminds the State that in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The state inadvertently did not include the link but data was available at the following link <https://nep.education.ne.gov//State/Index/00-0000-000?DataYears=20182019&type=state#nesa-scores> this information is always publicly displayed.

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR required the State to provide OSEP with a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The State provided the required information.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the

second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

235

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	10	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

One district suspended or expelled more students with disabilities for greater than 10 days than in the prior year, while the number of students with disabilities in the district decreased from year to year.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For indicator 4A, a significant discrepancy in the rate of out-of-school suspension/expulsions for greater than 10 days is defined as a district-level long-term suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities of greater than 5%. Nebraska's methodology uses a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum n-size of 30. Across the state of Nebraska, only 825 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2018. Only one district was identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2017 for Indicator 4A. Only 10 districts long-term suspended/expelled at least 10 students with disabilities for more than 10 days in 2017-18. Of the other 234 districts, 74 districts suspended between 1 and 8 students with disabilities and 146 districts suspended no students with disabilities for more than 10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Nebraska requires LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity to complete and return a policy and procedure review checklist which includes these factors. LEAs with significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity are also encouraged to take steps to identify and address the root causes of the discrepancies before they are found to have a significant disproportionality.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

238

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	6	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

A significant discrepancy in the rate of out-of-school suspension/expulsions for greater than 10 days is defined as a long-term suspension/expulsion rate of greater than 5% for students with disabilities of any racial or ethnic group. Nebraska's methodology uses a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum n-size of 30. Across the state of Nebraska, only 825 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2018. For each of Nebraska's 245 districts, the Nebraska Department of Education calculates a suspension and expulsion rate for each of the seven race and ethnicity reporting categories. (Note: many districts do not have members of every race and ethnicity reporting category enrolled in the district.) Only one district was identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2018 for Indicator 4B. Only six districts long-term suspended or expelled at least 10 students of a given race/ethnicity. This illustrates the very small numbers of students with disabilities for a particular racial/ethnic group that are being suspended.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Nebraska identified one district that exceeded the measurement. NDE has conducted a review of this district's policies, procedures and practices, including an on-site file review, relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). Nebraska found the district to have appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place and has met requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, and use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

If YES, select one of the following:

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that the number of districts that met the State's minimum n size is six and the number of districts that did not meet the State's minimum n size and were excluded from the calculation is 238 which totals 244. However, the State reported in its narrative for this indicator that the State used 245 districts in its calculation. Because of this discrepancy, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4B- Required Actions

The State did not provide data for FFY 2018. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	72.20%	72.60%	73.10%	73.60%	74.10%
A	72.06%	Data	74.59%	76.07%	75.54%	76.75%	77.78%
B	2009	Target <=	6.65%	6.58%	6.52%	6.45%	6.39%
B	6.69%	Data	6.34%	6.36%	6.62%	6.68%	6.26%
C	2009	Target <=	2.74%	2.62%	2.50%	2.38%	2.26%
C	2.96%	Data	2.15%	2.22%	2.12%	2.08%	2.32%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	74.60%	74.60%
Target B <=	6.33%	6.33%
Target C <=	2.14%	2.14%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	45,454
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	35,545
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,863
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	825
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	79
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	83

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	35,545	45,454	77.78%	74.60%	78.20%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,863	45,454	6.26%	6.33%	6.30%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	987	45,454	2.32%	2.14%	2.17%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside the regular class less than 40% of the day							
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	63.20%	70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%
A	62.91%	Data	74.19%	72.97%	77.65%	73.55%	80.38%
B	2011	Target <=	14.90%	5.70%	5.70%	5.60%	5.60%
B	24.62%	Data	5.70%	4.96%	4.89%	4.45%	3.59%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	75.00%	75.00%
Target B <=	5.50%	5.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	6,551
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,318
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	170
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	53
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,318	6,551	80.38%	75.00%	81.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	224	6,551	3.59%	5.50%	3.42%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2014	Target >=	64.60%	80.10%	74.50%	74.75%	75.00%
A1	74.76%	Data	80.13%	74.76%	76.62%	76.45%	67.57%
A2	2014	Target >=	73.00%	73.10%	69.07%	70.00%	70.25%
A2	69.91%	Data	73.08%	69.91%	69.12%	68.84%	61.53%
B1	2014	Target >=	62.40%	81.20%	75.00%	75.25%	75.50%
B1	75.19%	Data	81.22%	75.19%	76.53%	78.00%	74.23%
B2	2014	Target >=	62.80%	73.00%	69.75%	70.00%	70.25%
B2	69.86%	Data	72.95%	69.86%	69.65%	69.23%	70.27%
C1	2014	Target >=	65.20%	81.60%	75.50%	75.75%	76.00%
C1	75.58%	Data	81.58%	75.58%	69.43%	74.28%	95.77%
C2	2014	Target >=	76.00%	77.40%	75.00%	75.25%	75.50%
C2	75.16%	Data	77.41%	75.16%	75.62%	88.04%	96.18%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	75.25%	75.25%
Target A2 >=	70.50%	70.50%
Target B1 >=	75.75%	75.75%
Target B2 >=	70.50%	70.50%
Target C1 >=	76.25%	76.25%
Target C2 >=	75.75%	75.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Included in Introduction

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,139

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	109	5.10%

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	416	19.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	346	16.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	657	30.72%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	611	28.56%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,003	1,528	67.57%	75.25%	65.64%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,268	2,139	61.53%	70.50%	59.28%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	109	5.10%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	360	16.83%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	274	12.81%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	747	34.92%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	649	30.34%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,021	1,490	74.23%	75.75%	68.52%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,396	2,139	70.27%	70.50%	65.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	41	1.92%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	822	38.43%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	87	4.07%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	186	8.70%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,003	46.89%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	273	1,136	95.77%	76.25%	24.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	1,189	2,139	96.18%	75.75%	55.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>This year Nebraska's Part B OSEP data demonstrated a decline in Summary Statements 1 and 2 for Outcomes A, B, and C. For Outcomes A and B, this is a continuation of a downward trend that was noted last year. Prior to the last two years, the data was either staying the same or increasing slightly. For Outcome C, states had been working with TS GOLD to modify the underlying algorithm used as TS GOLD had modified the scale and the resulting outcomes summary statements were extremely high. It was expected that the Summary Statements for Outcome C would be lower this year as the algorithm was applied. Once we have 2-3 years of data with the adjusted data, Nebraska will be able to reset its targets for Outcome C.</p> <p>In reviewing current state infrastructure practices, there has not been any major shifts or changes. Inter-rater reliability and completion of TS GOLD training modules are still required of providers. Statewide training was provided as in previous years and was expanded to include a comprehensive administrator training.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool to include items up to third grade. We have been working with Teaching Strategy to determine if there may be a link to the downward trends we have seen and this platform change. Earlier this fall we met with other states using the online GOLD system for OSEP reporting and many indicated that they were also seeing similar downward trends in their data. Last year in response to the data slippage, Nebraska has had ongoing meetings with Teaching Strategies staff in partnership with ECTA and DaSY Centers to review the potential issues and analyze the data to determine the root cause of these unexpected changes to the summary statements and develop solutions to improve the validity of data for reporting outcomes in the future. The data analyses has just been completed and a meeting to review the data and determine action steps will occur this winter. If satisfactory solutions are not generated, the state is committed to examine potential alternatives for its statewide assessment.</p>
A2	<p>This year Nebraska's Part B OSEP data demonstrated a decline in Summary Statements 1 and 2 for Outcomes A, B, and C. For Outcomes A and B, this is a continuation of a downward trend that was noted last year. Prior to the last two years, the data was either staying the same or increasing slightly. For Outcome C, states had been working with TS GOLD to modify the underlying algorithm used as TS GOLD had modified the scale and the resulting outcomes summary statements were extremely high. It was expected that the Summary Statements for Outcome C would be lower this year as the algorithm was applied. Once we have 2-3 years of data with the adjusted data, Nebraska will be able to reset its targets for Outcome C.</p> <p>In reviewing current state infrastructure practices, there has not been any major shifts or changes. Inter-rater reliability and completion of TS GOLD training modules are still required of providers. Statewide training was provided as in previous years and was expanded to include a comprehensive administrator training.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool to include items up to third grade. We have been working with Teaching Strategy to determine if there may be a link to the downward trends we have seen and this platform change. Earlier this fall we met with other states using the online GOLD system for OSEP reporting and many indicated that they were also seeing similar downward trends in their data. Last year in response to the data slippage, Nebraska has had ongoing meetings with Teaching Strategies staff in partnership with ECTA and DaSY Centers to review the potential issues and analyze the data</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>to determine the root cause of these unexpected changes to the summary statements and develop solutions to improve the validity of data for reporting outcomes in the future. The data analyses has just been completed and a meeting to review the data and determine action steps will occur this winter. If satisfactory solutions are not generated, the state is committed to examine potential alternatives for its statewide assessment.</p>
B1	<p>This year Nebraska's Part B OSEP data demonstrated a decline in Summary Statements 1 and 2 for Outcomes A, B, and C. For Outcomes A and B, this is a continuation of a downward trend that was noted last year. Prior to the last two years, the data was either staying the same or increasing slightly. For Outcome C, states had been working with TS GOLD to modify the underlying algorithm used as TS GOLD had modified the scale and the resulting outcomes summary statements were extremely high. It was expected that the Summary Statements for Outcome C would be lower this year as the algorithm was applied. Once we have 2-3 years of data with the adjusted data, Nebraska will be able to reset its targets for Outcome C.</p> <p>In reviewing current state infrastructure practices, there has not been any major shifts or changes. Inter-rater reliability and completion of TS GOLD training modules are still required of providers. Statewide training was provided as in previous years and was expanded to include a comprehensive administrator training.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool to include items up to third grade. We have been working with Teaching Strategy to determine if there may be a link to the downward trends we have seen and this platform change. Earlier this fall we met with other states using the online GOLD system for OSEP reporting and many indicated that they were also seeing similar downward trends in their data. Last year in response to the data slippage, Nebraska has had ongoing meetings with Teaching Strategies staff in partnership with ECTA and DaSY Centers to review the potential issues and analyze the data to determine the root cause of these unexpected changes to the summary statements and develop solutions to improve the validity of data for reporting outcomes in the future. The data analyses has just been completed and a meeting to review the data and determine action steps will occur this winter. If satisfactory solutions are not generated, the state is committed to examine potential alternatives for its statewide assessment.</p>
B2	<p>This year Nebraska's Part B OSEP data demonstrated a decline in Summary Statements 1 and 2 for Outcomes A, B, and C. For Outcomes A and B, this is a continuation of a downward trend that was noted last year. Prior to the last two years, the data was either staying the same or increasing slightly. For Outcome C, states had been working with TS GOLD to modify the underlying algorithm used as TS GOLD had modified the scale and the resulting outcomes summary statements were extremely high. It was expected that the Summary Statements for Outcome C would be lower this year as the algorithm was applied. Once we have 2-3 years of data with the adjusted data, Nebraska will be able to reset its targets for Outcome C.</p> <p>In reviewing current state infrastructure practices, there has not been any major shifts or changes. Inter-rater reliability and completion of TS GOLD training modules are still required of providers. Statewide training was provided as in previous years and was expanded to include a comprehensive administrator training.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool to include items up to third grade. We have been working with Teaching Strategy to determine if there may be a link to the downward trends we have seen and this platform change. Earlier this fall we met with other states using the online GOLD system for OSEP reporting and many indicated that they were also seeing similar downward trends in their data. Last year in response to the data slippage, Nebraska has had ongoing meetings with Teaching Strategies staff in partnership with ECTA and DaSY Centers to review the potential issues and analyze the data to determine the root cause of these unexpected changes to the summary statements and develop solutions to improve the validity of data for reporting outcomes in the future. The data analyses has just been completed and a meeting to review the data and determine action steps will occur this winter. If satisfactory solutions are not generated, the state is committed to examine potential alternatives for its statewide assessment.</p>
C1	<p>This year Nebraska's Part B OSEP data demonstrated a decline in Summary Statements 1 and 2 for Outcomes A, B, and C. For Outcomes A and B, this is a continuation of a downward trend that was noted last year. Prior to the last two years, the data was either staying the same or increasing slightly. For Outcome C, states had been working with TS GOLD to modify the underlying algorithm used as TS GOLD had modified the scale and the resulting outcomes summary statements were extremely high. It was expected that the Summary Statements for Outcome C would be lower this year as the algorithm was applied. Once we have 2-3 years of data with the adjusted data, Nebraska will be able to reset its targets for Outcome C.</p> <p>In reviewing current state infrastructure practices, there has not been any major shifts or changes. Inter-rater reliability and completion of TS GOLD training modules are still required of providers. Statewide training was provided as in previous years and was expanded to include a comprehensive administrator training.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool to include items up to third grade. We have been working with Teaching Strategy to determine if there may be a link to the downward trends we have seen and this platform change. Earlier this fall we met with other states using the online GOLD system for OSEP reporting and many indicated that they were also seeing similar downward trends in their data. Last year in response to the data slippage, Nebraska has had ongoing meetings with Teaching Strategies staff in partnership with ECTA and DaSY Centers to review the potential issues and analyze the data to determine the root cause of these unexpected changes to the summary statements and develop solutions to improve the validity of data for reporting outcomes in the future. The data analyses has just been completed and a meeting to review the data and determine action steps will occur this winter. If satisfactory solutions are not generated, the state is committed to examine potential alternatives for its statewide assessment.</p>
C2	<p>This year Nebraska's Part B OSEP data demonstrated a decline in Summary Statements 1 and 2 for Outcomes A, B, and C. For Outcomes A and B, this is a continuation of a downward trend that was noted last year. Prior to the last two years, the data was either staying the same or increasing slightly. For Outcome C, states had been working with TS GOLD to modify the underlying algorithm used as TS GOLD had modified the scale and the resulting outcomes summary statements were extremely high. It was expected that the Summary Statements for Outcome C would be lower this year as the algorithm was applied. Once we have 2-3 years of data with the adjusted data, Nebraska will be able to reset its targets for Outcome C.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>In reviewing current state infrastructure practices, there has not been any major shifts or changes. Inter-rater reliability and completion of TS GOLD training modules are still required of providers. Statewide training was provided as in previous years and was expanded to include a comprehensive administrator training.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool to include items up to third grade. We have been working with Teaching Strategy to determine if there may be a link to the downward trends we have seen and this platform change. Earlier this fall we met with other states using the online GOLD system for OSEP reporting and many indicated that they were also seeing similar downward trends in their data. Last year in response to the data slippage, Nebraska has had ongoing meetings with Teaching Strategies staff in partnership with ECTA and DaSY Centers to review the potential issues and analyze the data to determine the root cause of these unexpected changes to the summary statements and develop solutions to improve the validity of data for reporting outcomes in the future. The data analyses has just been completed and a meeting to review the data and determine action steps will occur this winter. If satisfactory solutions are not generated, the state is committed to examine potential alternatives for its statewide assessment.</p>

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

Every child aged 3-5 is entered into the Teaching Strategies Gold system. All children are compared to research based on Widely Held Expectations for their same aged peers based upon National norms.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Teaching Strategies (TS) GOLD, an authentic, observational assessment designed for children birth through 3rd grade, is the assessment used to gather data for Indicator C3. At the child's entry and at the time of exit from Part B teachers/providers gather and document information from observations of the child. This data forms the basis of the scoring across four areas of development (social emotional, physical, language, and cognitive) and two areas of content learning (literacy and mathematics). TS GOLD objectives and dimensions that comprise each of the functional outcomes that are reported are based on a crosswalk recommended by the national Early Childhood Training Center (ECTC)). Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are programmed into the TS GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores for each functional outcomes. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of the TS GOLD may be found at: <https://teachingstrategies.com/our-approach/research/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	89.37%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	78.90%	89.20%	89.80%	90.20%	90.80%
Data	89.37%	87.45%	88.15%	89.40%	91.56%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	91.80%	91.80%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,757	3,178	91.56%	91.80%	86.75%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

15,641

Percentage of respondent parents

20.32%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In order to accurately analyze slippage, the Parent Involvement rate in 2018-2019 was compared to the Parent Involvement rate in the most recent year that these districts were previously surveyed. Fifty two districts were surveyed in 2018-2019. Most of those 52 districts surveyed in 2018-19 were surveyed previously in 2013-14, 2014-15, or 2015-16 as Nebraska has changed from a five year cycle to a three year cycle to better align to our monitoring cycle.

When looking at parent involvement rate in all districts surveyed in the current year and in either 2013-14, 2014-15 or 2015-16, the previous-year parent involvement rate was 93.88% and the 2018-2019 rate was 79.02%. This shows a decrease in parent involvement around 5 percentage points.

To better determine what might be the reason for the decrease, item scores from 2018-19 to 2017-18 as well as previous year have been examined. These items as well as district scores over time will be examined thoroughly by the state to determine if any technical assistance is needed.

The three items that had the biggest decrease from 2017-18 to 2018-19 are:

6. At the Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting, we talk about whether my child needs extended school year (ESY) services.

*Decreased by 3.43 percentage points from 93.33% in 1718 to 89.90% in 1819.

11. The school helped my child with transitions (i.e., Preschool to Kindergarten; Elementary to Middle School/Junior High; and Middle School/Junior High to High School).

*Decreased by 3.09 percentage points from 96.49% in 1718 to 93.40% in 1819.

12. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.

*Decreased by 2.91 percentage points from 94.24% in 1718 to 91.34% in 1819.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Parents of all students with disabilities, including preschool students with disabilities, are given an opportunity to complete the Parent Survey. Nebraska utilizes the same survey document for school age and preschool age children. The Parent Survey was provided to parents by the school district using a variety of methods to encourage participation. These methods included giving the parent the survey at the student's annual IEP meeting, providing the survey at Parent-Teacher conferences and providing the survey at other school events. The survey was also available on-line and parents were provided with the website on which to record their responses to the survey. Lastly, the surveys were also available by mail to ensure families who do not have access to a computer were given an opportunity to participate. After analyzing the breakdown of survey responses, preschool response rate is similar to school aged response rate and outcomes. The preschool surveys are completed in the same manner, via parent meetings, IEP meetings, and other school events.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The 244 districts are categorized into five groups for surveying purposes, which is similar to the monitoring grouping. Each of the five groups is representative of the entire state in terms of geography, size of school district, and rates for race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, and special education.

In Nebraska, the differences among parents is not so much of a urban city vs. rural town issue (or big district vs. small district issue), but rather an eastern Nebraska vs. western Nebraska issue. The Nebraska Office of Special Education staff members noted in examining parent survey results from the past, there are more differences based on which side of Nebraska a parent resides than based on the size of the school district a parent resides. Thus, as long as the survey cycle consists of a geographical representative sampling of districts, then the survey results are representative of the state as a whole.

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students.

This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by district, by race/ethnicity of the child, by grade level of the child, and by the primary disability of the child.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

6

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	239	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Nebraska changed its methodology for disproportionality for Indicators 9 and 10 to better align with the Significant Disproportionality guidelines issued by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Disproportionate representation is defined as a risk ratio of 3.00 and above. The minimum cell size for all calculations is 10 and the minimum n size is 30. The alternate risk ratio was used for any districts where the comparison group failed to meet the cell or n size.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Nebraska calculates the risk ratio for all districts and conducts a review with districts that run the risk of disproportionate representation. Nebraska requires LEAs with a disproportionate representation to complete and return a policy and procedure review checklist to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The state did not identify any districts with disproportionate representation for Indicator 9.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that the number of districts that met the State established "n" size is 239 and the number of districts that did not meet the State established "n" size and were excluded from the calculation is six for a total of 245. However, the State reported in the introduction of its FFY 2018 APR that there are 244 districts in the State. Because of this discrepancy, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

9 - Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

54

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
17	0	191	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Nebraska changed its methodology for disproportionality for Indicators 9 and 10 to better align with the Significant Disproportionality guidelines issued by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Disproportionate representation is defined as a risk ratio of 3.00 and above. The minimum cell size for all calculations is 10 and the minimum n size is 30. The alternate risk ratio was used for any districts where the comparison group failed to meet the cell or n size.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Nebraska calculates the risk ratio for all districts and conducts a review with districts that run the risk of disproportionate representation. Nebraska requires LEAs with a disproportionate representation to complete and return a policy and procedure review checklist to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The state identified 17 districts with disproportionate representation for Indicator 10.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that the number of districts that met the State established "n" size is 54 and the number of districts that did not meet the State established "n" size and were excluded from the calculation is 191 for a total of 245. However, the State reported in the introduction of its FFY 2018 APR that there are 244 districts in the State. Because of this discrepancy, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

10 - Required Actions

The State did not provide data for FFY 2018. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	92.76%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.41%	99.80%	99.74%	98.43%	99.07%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
8,828	8,787	99.07%	100%	99.54%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

41

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

For the 2018-2019 reporting year, Nebraska is at 99.54% for completion of the initial evaluation within 45 school days, upon receipt of the parent consent to initial evaluation. There were 8828 parental consents received and 8787 initial evaluations completed within 45 school days. These numbers reflect the state as a whole, as opposed to prior years where districts to be monitored were reviewed. Prior to NDE review, within 25 districts, 159 children had timelines exceeding 45 school days set by the state of Nebraska. Of the 159 children, the range of days beyond 45 school days for eligibility determination was 1-98 days. The delays were attributed to parents canceling meetings, family scheduling conflicts, child availability, poor attendance, and student incarceration. Only 41 instances were delays due to the school.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The state's timeline was 45 school days.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Nebraska Department of Education, Special Education Office requires districts annually compile the evaluation data for their district, including total number of evaluations, the number who qualified within the 45 school days, the number who did not qualify within the 45 school days, the number not meeting the 45 school days, and the reason(s) for not meeting the 45 school days for each of the evaluations, whether they qualified or not. Based on this information NDE made compliance determinations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
87	87	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

In the LEAs where noncompliance was found, the LEA had to account for all instances of noncompliance and the root cause, and, if needed, modify the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance. The State required the LEAs to correct each case of noncompliance. The State then verified that each LEA in which noncompliance was identified is now correctly implementing the requirement specific to the finding of noncompliance. This verification is based on a review of subsequent data including a review of LEA policies and procedures.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The State conducted a review of updated data collected during an onsite visit and subsequent meetings with the LEA and review of student files at each LEA.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the 87 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,090
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	9
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	390

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	23
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	668

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	390	390	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

0

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Nebraska Student & Staff Record System (NSSRS) collects information on children/students with disabilities from birth to 21. As the children/students are tracked in one system, it can be determined which children transition from Part C to Part B. LEAs report on a secure website the result from their files for line D.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	86.73%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	77.24%	92.25%	100.00%	89.41%	85.16%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
288	317	85.16%	100%	90.85%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Special Education requires school districts to participate in an annual risk analysis where then, the 20% highest risk districts are determined to need differentiated monitoring. One component of this differentiated monitoring, a district file review is included to review school districts regarding the implementation of IDEA and Nebraska's Administrative Code 92NAC51 Regulations for Special Education. The 20% of districts that participate in differentiated monitoring are then asked to complete the Indicator 13 survey.

While completing the file review, a checklist is used to collect compliance data. The requirements of Indicator 13 are all included in the checklist. Monitoring team reviewers are trained on the file review checklist in order to ensure reporting consistency and inter-rater-reliability. The file review checklist is available electronically to allow for opportunity for review. Monitoring teams meet to discuss findings and review the summary report. The summary displays individual findings for each measurement of this indicator, as well as an overall percentage of compliance. This summary report is also used as a data source for self-assessment a district's transition programming. Nebraska used NSTTAC's "Indicator 13 Checklist A" questions to collect the data for Indicator 13. For FFY2018, districts who were monitored completed a self assessment of the Indicator 13 Checklist then onsite monitoring confirmed the self assessment data.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
42	42	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

In the LEAs where noncompliance was found, the LEA had to account for all instances of noncompliance and the root cause, and, if needed, modify the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance. The State required the LEAs to correct each case of noncompliance. The State then verified that each LEA in which noncompliance was identified is now correctly implementing the requirement specific to the finding of noncompliance. This verification is based on a review of subsequent data including a review of LEA policies and procedures.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The State conducted a review of updated data collected during an onsite visit and subsequent meetings with the LEA and review of student files at each LEA.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the 42 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	35.60%	35.60%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%
A	39.40%	Data	36.85%	37.05%	34.96%	38.16%	36.20%
B	2009	Target >=	65.50%	65.50%	65.80%	66.00%	66.50%
B	65.20%	Data	66.93%	66.79%	62.86%	61.84%	57.33%
C	2009	Target >=	82.90%	83.00%	83.20%	83.40%	83.40%
C	83.60%	Data	82.97%	85.01%	82.43%	78.69%	75.30%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	39.60%	39.60%
Target B >=	67.00%	67.00%
Target C >=	83.65%	83.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	823
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	254
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	104

3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	75
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	38

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	254	823	36.20%	39.60%	30.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	358	823	57.33%	67.00%	43.50%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	471	823	75.30%	83.65%	57.23%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Group A's drop this year is most likely due to a change in criteria that helped determine what is considered higher education. Last year's higher education was 36.2%, but that included vocational or technical schools (less than a 2-year program including certificate programs). This year however that criteria wasn't included for higher education, instead only community or technical college (2-year college) and college or university (4-year college) were used. This would help justify why Group A fell to 30.86%. If we included vocational or technical schools than the Group still fell, but only to 33.0%, so a much lower slip.
B	Group B: There are a lot more criteria for being competitively employed. Based on the packet we received, in order to be considered for current competitive employment this year (2019) the respondent needed to have additional things like benefits, opportunities for pay raises or promotions, working with non-disabled people, and being paid the same as those who work the same job. Last year (2018) respondents only needed to be working in a specific job type, work 90 days in the last 3 months, work 20 hours a week, and make at least minimum wage. The four new additional requirements lowered the percentage point for Group B from a potential 58.1% (if calculated the way we previously did it) to 43.5% (using these new criteria).
C	Group C: Other employment is another example of the additional requirements lowering the overall percentage for Target C. Last year, other employment only required that the respondent not be considered for competitive employment and work 90 days in the last 3 months. This year in order to qualify for other employment you have to meet far more requirements. If we kept the simple criteria from last year than Target C would be at 73.6%, but instead it fell to 57.23% due to all the extra requirements. Another reason it most likely fell is because it's built off the other targets, so with those other targets facing extra criteria and falling, it caused Target C to fall as well.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	

	Yes / No
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The demographics of the students surveyed are representative of the state demographics. The survey used for this data collection includes demographic information of the graduates surveyed and the contracted organization analyzing the data provides reports reflecting those demographics. The demographics of the students reflected in the survey are similar to those that reflect Nebraska as a whole.

The contracted organization utilizes demographic data as well as results of the survey to create reports for the State annually, reflecting the demographic makeup of the respondents and population as a whole by LEA, Educational Service Unit, and the SEA as a whole. Should an abnormality arise, the State would utilize the opportunity to provide targeted support to any affected areas.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The responses received through the Post Secondary Outcomes survey is representative of the demographic of youth no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The state is fairly homogeneous but all race/ethnicities, disability categories, and a distribution throughout the state is represented. The state is always working to improve response rate while ensuring the demographics are properly represented.

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	7
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	2

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017

Target >=					
Data		100.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.00%	0.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	7	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	Met Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	5
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from Stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska established a broad based Stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, special education directors, special education staff, general education administration (principals, superintendents), institutions of higher education, NDE teams (Approval/Accreditation, School Improvement, Curriculum and Instruction), community agencies, non-public schools, and the Nebraska State Education Association and the Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtained input from two longstanding Stakeholder groups with some members serving as liaisons to the RDA Stakeholder committees: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the State Results Matter Task Force. The council is established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of Stakeholders. SEAC and the Task Force, which regularly discusses the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein, has reviewed and supported the work of the Stakeholder group. SEAC and the Task Force will continue to be utilized for input on the development of Phases II and III of the SSIP and the SIMRs.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	
----------	------	--

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data	50.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.00%	0.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	5	5	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Amy Rhone

Title:

Assistant Director of Special Education

Email:

Amy.Rhone@nebraska.gov

Phone:

402-471-4323

Submitted on: